

Panaji, 28th April, 1988 (Vaisakha 8, 1910)

SERIES II No. 4

# OFFICIAL GAZETTE

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA



### GOVERNMENT OF GOA

#### Education Department

Order

No. DE/Acad.I/NEZ-Pe/13/SDES/78/Vol.III/1319

Read: 1) Memorandum No. DE/Acad.I/NEZ-Pe/13/SDES/78/Vol.III/3724 dated 16-12-1987.

2) Letter No. DES/87-88/388 dated 14-1-1988 from the Management of Shri Durga English High School, Parsem, Pernem — Goa.

Whereas a number of complaints were received by this Department and the Government about the improper functioning of Shri Durga English High School, Parsem, Pernem-Goa and also about the irregularity and mismanagement of the said school and on enquiry the Government has reason to believe that the school Authorities has obtained loans for construction of school building by fabricating documents as no such valid records of the Central Body or Managing Committee proceedings were made available to Dy. Education Officer at the time of enquiry.

Whereas Shri R. M. Sawant an Asstt. Teacher of the said school was functioning as the Manager of the school in contravention of Rule 46(j) of Education Rules, 1986, the Management has later on elected one Shri Hanuman G. Gawandi as Manager in place of Shri R. M. Sawant without submitting the list of the new Managing Committee duly certified by Registrar of Societies under Section 3 of Registration of Societies Act, 1860 attracting the provision of Sub-Section 1 (i) of Education Act, 1984 and whereas the Management has failed to provide minimum facilities such as furniture, teaching aids, stationary, sport material, Science equipment and Library books etc. as found out from Inspecting Officer during the inspection of the school carried out in 1986 and the same was also brought to the notice of Inspecting Officer during his visit by the teaching faculty and the Headmaster of the school about the various requirements which are not provided in the school to meet the ever growing need thus contravening the provision of Sub-Section 1 (ii) of Section 20 of Education Act, 1984.

And whereas a reply under No. DES/87-88/388 dated 14-1-1988 was received from the Management of the said school to the show cause notice issued vide this office Memorandum referred to at Sr. No. 1 above and on examination it was found that the reply was not satisfactory.

Now therefore the Government is left with no other alternative than to invoke sub-Section 1 of Section 20 of the Education Act, 1984 and order that the Management of Gomantak Education Society which runs Shri Durga English High School, Parsem, Pernem be taken over by Govt. with immediate effect for a period of 3 years in the first instance under the Provision of Sub-Section 1 of Section 20 of Education Act, 1984 and for which purpose Shri P. D. Kolambkar, Dy. Education Officer, North Educational Zone, Mapusa is appointed as an Authorised Officer on behalf of Director of Education, Government of Goa. Shri P. D. Kolambkar shall discharge his duties as per the Provision of Education Act, 1984 and Education Rules, 1986 and as per the instructions issued to him by Directorate of Education from time to time. Among other things the Authorised Officer shall:

1. Exercise full control over administration, financial and academic affairs of the school and see that all employees of the school shall be punctual in attendance and prompt in discharge of their duties entrusted to them by general or special orders as deemed fit.
2. Be responsible for maintaining strict discipline and devotion to duties on the part of all employees including the Headmaster and students of the school.
3. Be responsible to see that all the employees of the school including the Headmaster are present in the school during office hours as prescribed by the Authorised Officer and no employee including the Headmaster shall be allowed to leave school premises without prior written permission of the Authorised Officer and all representations if any shall be routed through the Administrator.
4. Be responsible to visit the school or cause to visit the school as frequently as possible so as to ascertain that the school functions at right times and all the employees of the school including the Headmaster discharge their duties sincerely, honestly and efficiently to the satisfaction of the public and the Department.
5. In case of any of the employees including the Headmaster acts in contravention of the instructions of the Authorised Officer or if there is an act of indiscipline or insubordination or flouting of the instructions issued by the Authorised Officer, such cases shall be dealt with as per the provision of Education Act, 1984 and Rules made thereunder.

The Government is also pleased to order that

- i) Every person incharge of Management of Gomantak Education Society's Shri Durga English School, Parsem, Pernem-Goa immediately before its Management is taken over shall deliver possession of the school property to secure proper Management to the Authorised Officer; and that
- ii) School fund, school staff account fund and the pupils fund shall be made available to the Authorised Officer for being spent for the purpose of Schools; and that
- iii) The Authorised Officer shall have the right to open any account in any bank or to draw money from any fund referred to in Section 10 of Education Act, 1984. No person in charge of the Management of the school at any time before the date on which the Management of the School is taken over under Sub-Section 1 shall have such right.

By order and in the name of Governor of Goa.

S. V. Kurade, Director of Education and Ex-Officio Additional Secretary to the Government.

Panaji, 20th April, 1988.

Order

No. DE/Acad.I/SEZ/ONS/21/83-84/1326

- Read: 1) Government order No. DE/Acad.I/SEZ/ONS/755/Part.II/335 dated 13-2-1984.
- 2) Order No. DE/Acad.I/SEZ/ONS/21/83-84/807 dated 6-4-1987.
  - 3) Order No. DE/Acad.I/ONS/21/83-84/3497 dated 25-11-1987.

Whereas the management of New English School Fatorda was taken over by the Government for the period of three years in the first instance under the provisions of rule 173 of G.I.A. code in March 1984 on account of gross mismanagement and alleged irregularities.

And whereas considering the vast improvement of all activities of the school and also maximum enrolment after taking over of the said school by Government and representation from the Parent teachers Association and other Villagers of Fatorda that school should not be handed over to the previous management, the Govt. was pleased to extend the period of taking over the management by the Govt. by one more year in terms of section 20 of Goa, Daman and Diu School Education vide order as referred at Sr. No. 2.

And Whereas considering the fact that the school is much progressing since 3 to 4 years under the control of the Administrator/Authorised officer and also considering the recent representation from the Parent teachers Association and other Villagers of Fatorda that the school should not be handed over to previous management.

Now therefore the Government of Goa, is pleased to extend the period of taking over the Management of the New English High School Fatorda by one more year in terms of sub-section (1) of section 20 of the Education Act 1984 and to appoint Shri R. S. Gramopadye Zonal Officer, South Education Zone, Margao as authorised Officer of the said school Fatorda with immediate effect who shall discharge his duties as per provisions of the Goa, Daman and Diu School Education Act 1984 and the Rules made there under and as per instructions issued by the Director of Education from time to time.

S. V. Kurade, Director of Education and Ex-Officio Additional Secretary to the Govt. of Goa.

Panaji, 20th April, 1988.

#### Order

No. 17/MISC/8575/EDN/I

Kum. Sandhya V. Godakhindi, is hereby temporarily appointed on ad-hoc basis as Lecturer in Applied Mechanics in Government Polytechnic, Panaji, with effect from 2-4-88 (F.N.) in the scale of Rs. 2200-4000/- plus the usual allowances admissible from time to time on the initial pay of Rs. 2200/- p.m.

The appointment is subject to the condition specified in the Office Memorandum No. 17/MISC/8575/EDN dated 8-3-88 and the Rules Regulation laid down by the Government from time to time.

The appointment is purely on adhoc basis and it will not bestow on the appointee any claim for regular appointment promotion to the Higher post and seniority and will be liable to be terminated by one month's notice or with payment of month's salary in lieu of notice.

The appointment is liable for termination in case the character and antecedents of the appointee are adverse so as to disqualify her from holding a post under Government.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

D. N. Accarwade, Under Secretary (Education).

Panaji, 21st April, 1988.

#### Department of Community Development and Panchayats

Office of the Collectorate of South Goa  
District, Margao

#### Notification

No. 71/3/ELN/VP/88

In exercise of the power vested in him under clause (a) of sub rule (5) of rule 9 of Goa, Daman and Diu Village Panchayat (Election Procedure) rules as amended by Amendment Rules 1986, I, Shri S. K. Gathwal, Collector of South Goa District, Margao, is hereby appoint "Aval Karkun" as Asstt. Returning Officer for the General Elections to the Village Panchayat of Sancoale in Mormugao Taluka, Margao.

S. K. Gathwal, Collector of South Goa District.

Margao, 25th April, 1988.

#### Revenue Department

#### Notification

No. 22/200/86-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/200/86-RD dated 26-5-87 published on page 198-200 of Series II, No. 16 of the Official Gazette, dated 16-7-87 and in two newspapers (1) Gomantak dated 1-6-87 (2) Navhind Times dated 17-7-87 it was notified under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land, specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification was likely to be needed for the public purpose viz. Land Acquisition for construction of Kirbhat Baida road in V. P. Nuven, Salcete.

And Whereas, the appropriate Government (hereinafter referred to as "the Government"), after considering the report made under sub-section (2) of section 5A of the said Act is satisfied that the land specified in the Schedule hereto is needed for the public purpose specified above (hereinafter referred to "the said land").

Now, Therefore, the Government hereby declares, under section 6 of the said Act that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also appoints, under clause (c) of section 3 of the said Act, the Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (Cell), Altinho, Panaji to perform the functions of a Collector South Goa District, Margao for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land, and directs him under section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the Office of the said Land Acquisition Officer, P.W.D. (Cell) Altinho, Panaji till the award is made under section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka: Salcete		Village: Nuven
Survey No. Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
261/3 part	O: Fr. Pedro Antonio Alvares.	385.00
"/7 part	O: Paixad Pereira. Xavier Pereira.	300.00
260/1 part	O: Lourenco Barreto.	260.00
"/8 part	O: Necessidade Coutinho.	300.00
"/17 part	O: Maria Clarina Piedade Mello e Barreto.	260.00
"/18 part	O: Inacio D'Silva.	275.00
257/1 part	O: Ligardo Dias.	1180.00
"/2 part	O: Francisco Xavier Miranda e Noronha.	1025.00
16/1 part	O: 1. Martino Figueredo. 2. Vithorina Figueredo. 3. Digo Figueredo.	340.00
16/4 part	O: 1. Jose Figueredo. 2. Francisco Xavier Figueredo. 3. Xavier Figueredo.	300.00
"/3 part	O: Gabriel Figueredo.	300.00
"/5 part	O: 1. Remadio Figueredo. 2. Salvador Figueredo.	308.00
17/1 part	O: 1. Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco. 2. Aulio Elias Gabriel Colaco. 3. Francisco de Conceico Colaco. 4. Lilia Maria de Carmo Colaco. 5. Alberto A. de Jesus Colaco.	1375.00
"/35 part	O: Rosalina Colaco.	80.00
"/39 part	O: Manuel Colaco.	50.00
"/42 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	35.00
"/44 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	40.00
"/54 part	O: Luis Colaco.	50.00
"/55 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	50.00
"/56 part	O: Piedade Colaco.	40.00
"/59 part	O: Inacio Colaco.	50.00
"/76 part	O: Piedade Colaco.	65.00
"/77 part	O: Antonio Colaco.	65.00

1	2	3
18/10 part	O: Luis Colaco.	28.00
"/12 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	24.00
"/13 part	O: Piedade Colaco.	20.00
"/14 part	O: Rigalina Colaco.	24.00
"/15 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	24.00
"/4 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	1025.00
"/34 part	O: Manuel Colaco.	30.00
"/35 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	25.00
"/36 part	O: Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	28.00
268/2 part	O: Dr. Rui Santos de Alvares.	612.00
268/3 part	O: Surya Upendra Raikar.	288.00
"/4 part	O: Vicenta Agostinho Miranda.	200.00
"/5 part	O: Thelma Gonjia Alvares Menezes.	230.00
"/6 part	O: Camilo Alvares.	225.00
259/1 part	O: Ermelino.	300.00
"/2 part	O: Edward D'Costa.	750.00
"/3 part	O: Caitano Conceicao Zeferino Gomes.	400.00
258/1 part	O: Edward D'Costa.	295.00
"/2 part	O: Caitano Conceicao Zeferino Gomes.	595.00
"/3 part	O: Mrs. Aurelia A. Fernandes.	295.00
15/3 part	O: — do —	175.00
"/4 part	O: Eurico das Dores Santana da Silva.	1300.00
14/1 part	O: Joaquim Piedade Dias.	200.00
"/14 part	O: Pedro Manuel Dias.	160.00
"/15 part	O: Timotio Piedade Dias.	225.00
"/16 part	O: Salvador Dias.	85.00
"/6 part	O: Fabrica of Holy Spirit Church Margao.	175.00
"/7 part	O: Joaquim Piedade Dias.	525.00
12/2 part	O: Jose Joaquim Mariano de Piedade.	1875.00
	Francisco Xavier de Piedade Colaco.	
	Jose Cubertino de Piedade Colaco.	
14/13 part	O: 1. Joaquim Piedade Dias.	60.00
	Pedro Manuel Dias.	
	Salvador Dias.	
	Timotio Piedade Dias.	
12/3 part	O: Helena Colaco.	625.00
Taluka: Salcete Village: Raia		
352/6 part	Fabrica de Igreja de Raia.	600.00
"/8 part	Luis Guilherme Dias Colaco.	600.00
"/7 part	— do —	200.00
	North: S. No. 262.	
	South: Village boundary of Raia.	
	East: S. No. 261/3, 7, 260/1, 8, 17 & 18 257/1 & 2, 16/1, 3, 4 & 5, 17/1, 35, 39, 42, 44, 54, 55, 56, 59 & 77, 18/10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 4, 34, 35, & 36.	
	West: S. No. 261/3, 7, 260/1, 8, 17, 18, 257/1 & 2, 16/1, 3, 4 & 5, 17/1, 35, 39, 42, 44, 54, 55, 56, 59, 76, 18/10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 34, 35 & 36.	
Total .....		19356.00

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 3rd March, 1988.

Notification

No. 22/8/87-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/8/87-RD dated 10-3-87 published on page 308-310 of Series, II, No. 22 of the Official Gazette dated 27-8-87 and in two newspapers (i) Gomantak dated 18-3-87 and (ii) Navhind Times dated 30-3-87 it was notified under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter re-

ferred to as the said land) was likely to be needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for the construction of Assolda Branch of S.I.P. from Ch. 0.010 kms. to 0.950 kms in Assolda village of Quepem Taluka.

And whereas, the Government being of the opinion that the acquisition of the said land is urgently necessary, hereby applies the provisions of sub-section (1) and sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act and directs that the Collector appointed under paragraph 2 below, shall, at any time, on the expiration of fifteen days from the date of the publication of the notice relating to the said land under sub-section (1) of section 9 of the said Act, take possession of the said land.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares under the provisions of section 6 of the said Act, that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also hereby appoints under clause (c) of Section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, S.I.P. Margao to perform the functions of the Collector, South Goa District, Margao, for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer, S.I.P. Margao till the award is made under section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka: Quepem		Village: Assolda
Survey No. Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
71/ 3 part	1. Dr. Vaman Gamba Sinai Sheldekar. 2. Sadashiv Shambu Raut Dessai. 3. Shankar Rama Raut Dessai. 4. Khandu Shambu Raut Dessai. 5. Ramesh Krishna Raut Dessai.	500.00
71/ 4 part	H: Vaman Gamba Sinai Sheldenkar. T: Antonio Fernandes.	390.00
70/ 1 part	H: 1. Anant Subraya Sinai Assoldekar. 2. Devidas Venkatesh Sinai Assoldekar. 3. Jaiwant Shambu Sinai Assoldekar. 4. Laxman Yeshwant Sinai Assoldekar. 5. Vassudev Hari Sinai Assoldekar.	780.00
79/28 part	H: — do —	475.00
81/63 part	H: — do — T: Antonio Martinho Fernandes.	45.00
81/55 part	H: — do — T: Rock Fernandes.	10.00
81/56 part	H: — do — T: Rock Fernandes.	175.00
81/51 part	H: — do — T: Silvester Fernandes.	50.00
81/57 part	H: — do — T: Jose Vincent Fernandes.	25.00
81/58 part	H: — do — T: Marian Fernandes.	30.00
81/59 part	H: — do — T: Paixep Fernandes. Silvester Fernandes. Antonio Martinho Fernandes.	40.00
81/52 part	H: — do — T: Floriana Fernandes.	35.00
81/48 part	H: — do — T: Peixo Fernandes. Rock Fernandes. Antonio Martinho Fernandes.	50.00
81/49 part	H: 1. Anant Subraya Sinai Assoldekar. 2. Devidas Venkatesh Sinai Assoldekar. 3. Vassudev Hari Sinai Assoldekar. 4. Jayawnt Shankar Sinai Assoldekar. 5. Laxman Yeshwant Sinai Assoldekar.	25.00

1	2	3
	6. Shankar Yeshwant Sinai Assoldekar.	
81/50 part	T: Inacio Fernandes.	
	H: — do —	35.00
	T: Baptisto Fernandes.	
81/53 part	H: — do —	50.00
	T: Antonio Martino Fernandes.	
81/54 part	H: — do —	40.00
	T: Floriana Fernandes.	
82/ 4 part	H: 1. Anant Subray Sinai Assoldekar.	575.00
	2. Shri Shantadurga Devasthan.	
	3. Devidas Venkatesh Sinai Assoldekar.	
	4. Jaywant Shankar Sinai Assoldekar.	
	5. Laxman Yeshwant Sinai Assoldekar.	
	6. Shankar Yeshwant Sinai Assoldekar.	
	7. Vassudev Hari Sinai Assoldekar.	
1/ 3 part	H: Shri Sateri Devasthan of Assolda.	50.00
1/ 2 part	H: Matu Shankar Raut Dessai.	400.00
	Pandu Vassu Raut Dessai.	
	Ismenia Marciano Purificaso.	
	Gomes e Rodrigues.	
	Hari Shambu Raut Dessai.	
	Premavati Dattu Prabhu Dessai.	
	Sadashiv Shambu Raut Dessai.	
	Vithal Shambu Raut Dessai.	
1/ 1 part	H: 1. Vithoba Babli Prabhu Dessai.	310.00
	2. Shivram Shanu Raut Dessai.	
	3. Primo Jesus Maria Jose Rodrigues.	
	4. Krishna Chandu Raut Dessai.	
	5. Purshottam Nagu Raut Dessai.	
	6. Gurudas Venkatesh Raut Dessai.	
53/ 0 part	H: Vithoba Babali Dessai.	415.00
	Shivram Shambu Raut Dessai.	
	Krishna Chandu Raut Dessai.	
	Purshottam Nagu Raut Dessai.	
	Nagu Venkatesh Raut Dessai.	
	Ismenia Marciano Purificacio	
	Gomes e Rodrigues.	
	Appa Datta Raut Dessai.	
52/ 1 part	H: 1. Vithoba Babali Prabhu Dessai.	160.00
	2. Shivram Shambu Raut Dessai.	
	3. Krishna Chandu Raut Dessai.	
	4. Purshottam Nagu Raut Dessai.	
	5. Nagu Venkatesh Raut Dessai.	
	6. Comunidade of Assolda.	
	7. Ismania Marciano Purificacao.	
	Gomes e Rodrigues.	
	8. Apa Datta Raut Dessai.	
52/ 2 part	H: Rama Xenai Assoldekar.	7.00
	<b>Boundaries:</b>	
	North: S. No. 71/3, 4, 70/1, 79/28,	
	81/51, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 82/4,	
	1/1, 2, 3, 53/0, 52/1.	
	South: Village boundary of Co-	
	tombi S. No. 71/3, 4, 70/1,	
	79/28, 81/63, 56, 57, 58, 59, 53,	
	54, 48, 50, 82/4, 1/1, 2, 3, 53/0,	
	55/1, 52/1.	
	East: 52/1, 2.	
	West: 71/3.	
	<b>Total .....</b>	<b>4672.00</b>

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 7th March, 1988.

#### Notification

No. 22/209/86-RD

Whereas by Government Notification No. 22/209/86-RD dated 23-1-87 published on page 42-43 of Series, II, No. 5 of the Official Gazette dated 30-4-87 and in two news-

papers (i) Gomantak dated 3-2-87 and (ii) Navhind Times dated 7-3-87, it was notified under section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894 (Central Act 1 of 1894) (hereinafter referred to as "the said Act") that the land specified in the Schedule appended to the said Notification (hereinafter referred to as the said land) was likely to be needed for public purpose, viz. Land Acquisition for construction of D.W.C. No. 8 Ch. 3870 M. of Right Bank Main Canal of A.I.P. Phase II at Gontelim.

And whereas, the Government being of the opinion that the acquisition of the said land is urgently necessary, hereby applies the provisions of sub-section (1) and sub-section (4) of section 17 of the said Act and directs that the Collector appointed under paragraph 2 below, shall, at any time, on the expiration of fifteen days from the date of the publication of the notice relating to the said land under sub-section (1) of section 9 of the said Act, take possession of the said land.

Now, therefore, the Government hereby declares under the provisions of section 6 of the said Act, that the said land is required for the public purpose specified above.

2. The Government also hereby appoints under clause(c) of section 3 of the said Act, the Special Land Acquisition Officer, A.I.P. Duler, Mapusa to perform the functions of the Collector, North Goa District, Panaji for all proceedings hereinafter to be taken in respect of the said land and directs him under section 7 of the said Act to take order for the acquisition of the said land.

3. A plan of the said land can be inspected at the office of the Special Land Acquisition Officer, A.I.P. Duler, Mapusa till the award is made under section 11.

#### SCHEDULE

(Description of the said land)

Taluka: Satari		Village: Gontelim
Survey No. Sub. Div. No.	Names of the persons believed to be interested	Approximate area in sq. mts.
1	2	3
45/11	Shri Pandu Rama Majik. Shri Vishnu Pundalik Narvekar.  North: S. No. 45/11 & 45/16. South: S. No. 45/11 & 46/1. East: S. No. 45/11. West: S. No. 45/11, 16.	105.00
Total .....		105.00

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 28th March, 1988.

Corrigendum

No. 22/214/85-RD

Read: Notification No. 22/214/85-RD dated 12-2-87 published in the Official Gazette Series II, No. 47 dated 19-2-1987 at pages 531 to 532 and Newspapers viz. Navhind Times dated 27-2-87 and Gomantak dated 14-2-87.

In the above mentioned notification the area of 1500.00 sq. mts. shown against survey No. 155/2 may be read as 1180.00 sq. mts. So also the total area may be read as 21178.00 sq. mts. instead of 21498.00 sq. mts.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

P. S. Nadkarni, Under Secretary (Revenue).

Panaji, 18th April, 1988.

## Department of Labour

## Order

No. 28/20/86-ID

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 3rd February, 1988.

## IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOVERNMENT

## OF GOA AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No. IT/18/86

Workmen

— Workmen/Party I

V/s.

M/s. Shri Kalanath Tiles Works

— Employer/Party II

Workmen/Party I represented by Shri Subhas Naik, Secretary, Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union.

Employer/Party II represented by Shri S. V. Kunloli-  
enkar, Labour Consultant.

Panaji, 18th January, 1988.

## AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of Goa, by its order No. 28/20/86-ILD dated 22nd July, 1986 with an annexure scheduled thereto which reads as follows:

## SCHEDULE

"Whether the action of M/s. Shri Kalanath Tile Works, Panchawadi Goa, in terminating the services of following 10 workmen with effect from 8-6-1985 is legal and justified.

1. Santeri B. Naik.
2. Beera Gawda.
3. Shridhar Naik.
4. Ankush Gawda.
5. Maulasab Jagirdar.
6. Netra D. Mepkar.
7. Ballappa.
8. Hasanva.
9. Peeravva.
10. Malkavva.

2. The reference was received in this office on 25-7-1986 when the Presiding Officer was not functioning. After I joined, under my instructions, notices were issued to the parties and the first date of hearing was fixed on 27-11-1987. On that day, Shri Subhas Naik, Secretary, Goa Trade and Commercial Workers' Union for the workmen was present but the employer was absent though duly served with the notice. On the adjourned date fixed for hearing today that is the 18th day of January, 1988 a Memorandum of Settlement was submitted before me by the employer's representative Shri S. V. Kunloli-  
enkar and informed the Tribunal that the matter under dispute, referred to this Tribunal has been mutually settled between the parties and that the Court be pleased to pass award in terms of the settlement stated above.

3. A zerox copy of the settlement together with 3 annexures "A", "B" and "C" is produced along with the application for withdrawal of the dispute. Upon a cursory perusal of the terms of settlement it appears that the management had declared a lock-out and had closed the factory with effect from 19-8-1985, thereby rendering all the workers jobless. It appears that the parties and the Union in particular felt that the workers should get some work, some of them atleast should be employed and that there should be an industrial peace in the factory. Hence the terms of

settlement are worked out about the re-starting of the factory and payment of wages and increment in instalment, etc., and rise in monthly salary. These conditions are incorporated in clause 1 to 17 of the settlement and we are not much concerned with those terms of settlement as they do not form a subject matter to this present reference.

4. The present reference has been made by the Government on behalf of the 10 workers who were retrenched from services and the reference was made to adjudicate whether the termination of the services of those 10 workers with effect from 8-6-1985 is legal and justified. As per the terms of settlement and as per the clause No. 18 in particular it appears that the Union/Workmen have reconciled to the position that the management should be allowed to lay off some of its workers and the 10 workers in question who are noted in annexure "C" of the settlement are the workmen who were retrenched from services w.e.f. 8-6-1985. As per the clause 18 of the settlement which is an overall settlement pertaining to the closure and lock out the Union has accepted the retrenchment of the services of the 10 workmen noted as per annexure "C". As the management has requested the Tribunal to pass award in terms of the settlement and as the Union/Workmen have no objection to pass such a award, I feel that the retrenchment be held to be justified and hence I accept the terms of the settlement and pass the following order:

## ORDER

Consent award in terms prayed for is hereby made. By way of further clarification and with reference to clause 18 of the settlement in particular it is hereby held that the action of M/s. Shri Kalanath Tile Works in terminating the services of 10 workmen whose names are given in the schedule and whose names are again re-incorporated in annexure "C" of the settlement is legal and justified. There shall be no order as to costs.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal.

## Order

No. 28/30/81-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 24th March, 1988.

## IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL

## GOVERNMENT OF GOA

## AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No. IT/35/82

Workmen

— Workmen/Party I

V/s.

M/s. Shree Haresh Saw Mills

— Employer/Party II

Workmen represented by Shri P. Ghodge, Labour Consultant.

Employer represented by Adv. B. G. Kamat.

Panaji, Dated: 10th March, 1988.

## AWARD

The Government of Goa by its reference No. 28/30/81-ILD dated 30th June, 1982 made the reference under section 10 sub-section (d) of sub-section 1 of the Industrial Dispute Act for the adjudication of the matter between the workmen of Haresh Saw Mills and the Haresh Saw Mills.

As per the scheduled appended the reference the workmen represented by the Goa Shops and Industrial Workers Union, Margao had made demands regarding the classification of



the workmen, pay scale and fitment, earned leave National Holidays and Medical Expenditure.

Since 1982, the matter under reference was pending in this court and the parties had filed their statements about the respective claims. The issue regarding the locus standi of the union was also framed and evidence of a partner of the mills was also recorded. Since then while the matter was pending in the court the party No. II through its representative filed a statement on 7-3-1988 informing the court that the services of all the workmen employed by party No. II were terminated from 9-11-1981 on payment of all their legal dues. Consequently the Party No. II informed the Court that there was no question of adjudication of the reference.

On this statement Shri P. Ghodge representing the workmen endorsed that the workmen are no more in service and the reference be dismissed. In view of the two statements I pass the following order:

#### ORDER

In view of the clear statements of the parties the matter stands disposed off with no order as to costs.

The Government may be informed accordingly.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal.

#### Order

No. 28/27/86-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Subhash V. Elekar, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 24th March, 1988.

#### IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No. IT/20/86

Shri Raghuvir Sawant — Workman/Party I

V/s.

M/s. Marinecrete Shipbuilders — Employer/Party II

Workman represented by the General Secretary, Subhas Naik.

Employer Represented by Adv. G. K. Sardesai.

Panaji, Dated: 10th March, 1988.

#### A W A R D

This is a Reference made by the Government of Goa by its order No. 28/27/86-ILD dated 24th July, 1986 which is the Annexure thereto, reads as follows:

1. "Whether the action of M/s. Marinecrete Shipbuilders, Panaji-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Roguvir Sawant, Welder w.e.f. 15-10-85 is legal and justified?"

If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. "Whether the demand of the Goa Mining Labour Welfare Union for full wages to Shri Roguvir Sawant, Welder for the period from 24-1-85 to 9-9-85 is justified?"

If so to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

After the notices, the parties put in their appearance and while the matter was being adjourned for the statement of the parties, the parties arrived at a settlement under section 2(p) read with section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

The Memo containing the short recital of the case and terms of settlement dated Nil is produced before me on 8-3-1988. Upon a perusal of the settlement I find that the Union on behalf of the workman has accepted Rs. 5200/-

as retrenchment compensation, gratuity and wage in full and final settlement of all his legal dues. Consequently the workman has given up his claim for reinstatement and has agreed not to raise the industrial dispute as regards his termination from service. This being only issue under the reference the Award in terms of consent is being made and I pass the following order:

#### ORDER

Consent Award in terms of settlement is hereby made. The reference is answered accordingly. Inform Government about the Award.

There shall be no order as to cost.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal.

#### Order

No. 28/2/88-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Subhash V. Elekar, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 24th March, 1988.

#### IN THE LABOUR COURT GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Application No. LCC/5/86

Shri Usman Khan — Applicant

V/s. M/s. Shipwrights — Opponent

Applicant present in person.

Opponent is absent though duly served.

Panaji, Dated: 10th March, 1988.

#### AWARD

This is an application filed by an Ex Employee against the employer claiming certain dues as required under section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The employer is a proprietary concerned run by one Sikandar Khan and the party I claims to be working for him for the period of three months as a salary of Rs. 700/- per month.

It appears that the employer concerned was undertaking the job of painting and repairing the ships at the harbour and for this work the employer needed the services of casual labourers. The party No. I claims that he was assigned the duties of searching contracts and making arrangements for the labourers and his salary was fixed at Rs. 700/- per month.

According to him he worked for the three months of April, May and June, 1986 and out of the total dues of Rs. 2100/- he had received the advance of Rs. 500/- and the balance of Rs. 1600/- remained to be paid. According to him, as the employer failed to make the payment in spite of repeated demands, he approached the Labour Inspector at Vasco. It appears that the Labour Inspector issued notice to the employer and tried to arrange for the settlement but to no avail as the employer was non co-operative. Consequently, this reference came to be made.

After registration notice was sent to the employer through registered post the first packet returned unserved after five attempts and with last endorsement dated 21-12-87 that the party was out of station. Hence a fresh notice under registered post was sent and the postal endorsement dated 12-2-1988 shows that the employer has refused to accept the letter of summons. This is a valid service and it was decided to proceed ex-parte against the employer. Today the statement of the party No. I was recorded and as the same has gone unchallenged I hold that the party No. I has proved the claim for Rs. 1600/- Hence I grant the claim and pass the following order:

## ORDER

The opponent Sikandar Khan of M/s. S. K. Shipwrights of Vasco Goa do pay an amount of Rs. 1600/- to the applicant/workman. There shall be no order as to cost.

This Award be reported to the Government.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Labour Court.

Order

No. 28/16/84-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Subhash V. Elekar, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 6th April, 1988.

# IN THE INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL GOVERNMENT OF GOA AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Reference No.: IT/24/86

Shri Vasant Gopal Mapari

— Workman

V/s.

The Sarpanch, Village Panchayat, Collem, Sanguem, Goa

— Employer

The Workman is represented by Shri Subhash Naik, Secretary, Goa Trade & Commercial Workers' Union, Panaji.

Panaji, Dated.: 3-3-1988.

## AWARD

This is a reference made by the Government of Goa under reference No. 29/16/84-ILD dated 5th September, 1986 with an annexure scheduled thereto which reads as follows:

I. "Whether Shri Vasant Gopal Mapari, Peon, employed at Village Panchayat, Collem, Sanguem-Goa is a 'workman' as per section 2(s) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947".

II. "Whether the Village Panchayat, Collem, Sanguem-Goa, is an 'Industry' as per section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947".

III. "Whether the action of Village Panchayat, Collem, Sanguem-Goa, in terminating the services of Shri Vasant Gopal Mapari, Peon w.e.f. 23-12-83 is legal and justified.

If not, to what relief the workman is entitled to?"

2. The above reference was made at the instance of the Peon working in the Village Panchayat. He had joined the services on 1-12-1966 at the initial salary of Rs. 75/- per month. When the Government's scales were made applicable to the Village Panchayat workers from 1971, he was put into the scale of 72.85 paise plus D.A., C.C.A. and House Rent. While he continued to get salaries at the revised rate, in 1973, the scales recommended by the Third Pay Commission were made applicable to Village Panchayat employees also. Hence, in the revised scale he continued service till November, '83 when he was drawing the salary of Rs. 656.80 per month.

3. In Nov., '83 the Village Panchayat felt that the salaries paid to the Peon were exorbitant and the Village Panchayat would ill-efford to pay such a huge salary to a Peon who was not quite necessary in the Panchayat. Hence, by a letter dated 22-11-1983 (vide Exb.W-1) the then Sarpanch of the Panchayat informed the workman that the total revenue of the Panchayat was Rs. 40,000/- per annum while the salary of the peon per year came to Rs. 7750/-. The Chairman informed the Peon that the Panchayat has no funds to pay him and the Panchayat by resolution No. 7 dated 20-11-1983 had resolved that the services of the Peon should be termi-

nated. He therefore, informed the Peon that it was a notice of one month and his services stood terminated w.e.f. 23-12-1983.

4. The Peon felt that the termination of his service amounted to retrenchment and approached the Government with a claim for relief and the above reference came to be made at his instance. Initially, the Panchayat had taken an objection to the reference on the ground that the Peon was not a workman and as such the reference was not tenable in law. My Predecessor, by his order dated 11-9-85 held that the Panchayat Peon was a workman within the meaning of Section 25 of the Act and this is how issues 1 & 2 were already disposed off.

5. After I took over, the only issue which survived for consideration was regarding the action of the Village Panchayat in terminating the services of the Peon and whether the action is just and legal. The Peon has filed his claim statement in extenso reiterating that the termination of his service amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of Sec. 25F of the Act. Hence, he claims reinstatement with full back wages and continuity of service. The present Chairman of the Village Panchayat who was duly served with the summons did not appear in the Court. After the evidence of the workman was recorded on 17-2-1988, I felt that one more opportunity should be given to the Sarpanch of the Village Panchayat feeling that he had not properly understood the importance of the matter. Hence, at my instance, one more notice was issued to the Sarpanch returnable on this day i.e. 3-3-88. The Secretary of the Village Panchayat has received the notice on 25-2-88 as seen from the postal acknowledgement bearing the rubber stamp of the Village Panchayat. Still nobody appeared on behalf of the Panchayat. It seems that still the Village Panchayat labours under a wrong impression that the proceeding is not important and it has nothing to lose or gain in the matter. The workman and the Union Secretary, Shri Subhas Naik said in the peon court that the Sarpanch and others expressed before them that the Village Panchayat was not bound to take back the ex-Peon and they were not going to appear in the matter. Be that so as it may, it appears that the claim of the workman who is already held to be a workman has gone uncontested and what this Tribunal has to see is whether the termination amounts to retrenchment within the meaning of section 25F of the Industrial Disputes Act.

6. Upon a careful consideration of the facts and evidence on record it has to be held that the termination amounts to retrenchment simpliciter and in fact no case law is needed. All the same reliance is placed on the ruling of the Supreme Court reported in 1981(2) Labour Law Journal page 70 wherein the facts are almost similar. In that case a Salesman in a Private Limited Company drawing a salary of Rs. 520/- per month was removed from service, his service was abruptly terminated by a letter dated 12th Oct., 1974 w.e.f. 19th October, 1974. The Labour Court on evaluation of evidence both oral and documentary held that the termination of the service was in accordance with the Standing Orders justifying the removal of the employee. While reappraising the same set of facts the Supreme Court felt that pre-requisites for valid retrenchment as laid down in Sec. 25F had not been complied with and the retrenchment bringing about termination of service was ab-initio void.

7. Comparing those facts with the present case, I find that the resolution of the Village Panchayat dated 20-11-1983 is mis-conceived and the Village Panchayat has wrongly directed itself that it can terminate the services of the Peon by a simple resolution without assigning any reason. I find that the action of the Village Panchayat is both unjust and illegal. I, therefore, answer point no. 3 accordingly and hold that the Party No. 1/Workman is entitled to reinstatement with back wages.

In the result, I pass the following order.

## ORDER

It is hereby held that the termination of service of Party No. 1/Workman Shri Vasant Gopal Mapari is void and inoperative and the same is not just and legal. It is therefore declared that the Party No. 1, continues to be in service of the Village Panchayat, Collem, with all consequential benefits namely back wages in full and other benefits. The reference is answered accordingly. This order of award be reported to the Government. There shall be no order as to costs.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal.

## Order

No. 28/41/86-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary, (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 7th April, 1988.

## IN THE LABOUR COURT, GOVERNMENT OF GOA

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Application No. LCC/3/86

Miss Celia Fernandes — Applicant

V/s

M/s. Scan Consultants Ltd. — Opponent

Panaji, dated 27th February, 1988.

## AWARD

This is an application filed by an ex-employee against the employer claiming certain dues as required under Sec. 33-C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It seems that the concern by name Scan Consultants Ltd., was run by one Prabhu Yalagi having his office at Pelican Apartments, Altinho road, Panaji.

2. The Party No. I, it seems was working with the concern of Prabhu Yalagi as Steno-Secretary at the initial salary for Rs. 400/- per month, her service having started from January, 1985. She was also awarded the benefit of medical reimbursement subsequently.

3. She has filed the claim for dues in this petition and simultaneously she had filed a claim with the Labour Commissioner for re-instatement. That matter was referred to the Labour and Industries Department and after the Government reference dated 10th December, 1986 was received that matter was registered at IT/35/86, under Section 10(1)(d) of the Act and that matter is being treated as companion proceedings along with this matter. It appears that the concern of the employer Prabhu Yalagi has become defunct concern and the employer has gone to stay at Dharwad on the address given in the claim petitions. It appears that the employer got a scent of the proceedings filed by this applicant as well as another employee who worked as an Accounts Asstt. Hence it appears that he started adopting dilatory tactics about receiving the summons. One postal endorsement on the registered packet sent on the same address dated 2-1-1988 states that the addressee refused summons. At my instance a fresh summons was issued on the very same address and now the endorsement shown that the Postman visited the house consecutively on 7 to 8 occasions and the final endorsement says that the addressee is not found. I presume that the employer knows about the proceedings and that is why the first endorsement says that he refused the summons. Further, it is brought on record that the 2 employees have filed criminal cases against the employer in respect of the cheques which had bounced back. I, therefore, hold that the employer is duly served and I proceeded with the matter by recording the statement of the applicant/employee.

4. In her statement the applicant makes the following claim.

1. Salary for August/September @ Rs. 400/- p.m. ... ..	Rs. 800.00
2. Medical Re-imbursement ... ..	Rs. 115.60
3. Salary from 1st October till 5th October 1985 plus 1 month salary on retrenchment. ... ..	Rs. 464.52
4. Medical Re-imbursement ... ..	Rs. 126.26
5. Gratuity at the rate of 15 days average wages for 9 months ... ..	Rs. 200.00
<b>Total ... ..</b>	<b>Rs. 1706.38</b>

5. This claim is supported by the statement of the applicant on oath as well as the four cheques issued by the employer who at the time of issuing the cheques was convinced about the legitimacy of the claim made by the employee. Hence I grant the claim in toto and I pass the following award:

## ORDER

The Opponent do pay an amount of Rs. 1706.38 (Rupees one thousand seven hundred and six and paise thirty eight only) as full claim of the applicant/workman from the employer. There shall be no order as to costs.

This award be reported to the Government.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Labour Court.

## Order

No. 28/42/86-ILD

The following Award given by the Industrial Tribunal, Goa, Daman and Diu is hereby published as required under the provisions of Section 17 of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947 (Central Act XIV of 1947).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 7th April, 1988.

## IN THE LABOUR COURT

GOVERNMENT OF GOA

AT PANAJI

(Before Shri S. V. Nevagi, Hon'ble Presiding Officer)

Application No.: LCC/2/86

Miss Yvonne D'Souza — Applicant

V/s.

M/s. Scan Consultants Ltd. — Opponent

Panaji. Dated: 27th Feb., 1988.

## AWARD

This is an application filed by an ex-employee against the employer claiming certain dues as required under Sec. 33 C(2) of the Industrial Dispute Act, 1947. It seems that the concern by name Scan Consultants Ltd., was run by one Prabhu Yalagi having his office at Pelican Appartments, Altinho road, Panaji.

2. The Party No. I, it seems was working with the concern of Prabhu Yalagi as Accounts Asstt. at the initial salary for Rs. 700/- per month, her services having started from April, 1985. She was also awarded the benefit of medical re-imbursement subsequently.

3. She has filed the claim for dues in this petition and simultaneously she had filed a claim with the Labour Commissioner for reinstatement. That matter was referred to the Labour and Industries Department and after the Government reference dated 10th December, 1986 was received that matter was registered at IT/36/86, under Sec. 10(1)(d) of the Act and that matter is being treated as companion proceedings along with this matter. It appears that the concern of the employer Prabhu Yalagi has become defunct concern and the employer has gone to stay at Dharwad on the address given in the claim petitions. It appears that the employer got a scent of the proceedings filed by the applicant as well as another employee who worked as an Steno-Secretary. Hence it appears that he started adopting dilatory tactics, about receiving the summons. One postal endorsement on the registered packet sent on the same address dated 2-1-1988 states that the addressee refused summons. At my instance a fresh summons was issued on the very same address and now the endorsement shows that the Postman visited the house consecutively on 7 to 8 occasions and the final endorsement say that the addressee is not found. I presume that the employer knows about the proceedings and that is way the first endorsement says that he refused the summons. Further, it is brought on record that the 2 employees have filed a criminal cases against the employer in respect of the cheques which had bounced back.



I, therefore, hold that the employer is duly served and I proceeded with the matter by recording the statement of the applicant/employee.

4. In her statement the applicant makes the following claim:

1. Salary for August/September @ Rs. 700/- per month	Rs. 1400.00
2. Medical Re-imburement	Rs. 108.42
3. Salary from 1st Oct., till 5th Oct., '85 plus 1 month salary on retrenchment	Rs. 812.90
4. Medical Re-imburement	Rs. 59.98
5. Gratuity at the rate of 15 days average wages for 6 months	Rs. 350.00
Total	Rs. 2731.30

5. This claim is supported by the statement of the applicant on oath as well as the four cheques issued by the employer who at the time of issuing the cheques was convinced about the legitimacy of the claim made by the employee. Hence I grant the claim in toto and I pass the following award.

#### ORDER

The Opponent do pay an amount of Rs. 2731.30 (Rupees two thousand seven hundred and thirty one and paise thirty only) as full claim of the applicant/workman from the employer/opponent. There shall be no order as to costs.

This award be reported to the Government.

S. V. Nevagi, Presiding Officer, Labour Court.

Panaji, 27th February, 1988.

#### Finance Department

Order

No. 3-5-84-85-Fin(R&C)Part. III

In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 5 of the Goa, Daman and Diu Entertainment Tax Act, 1964 (2 of 1964), the Government of Goa is pleased to exempt the feature film "ANKAHEE" from the liability of payment of entertainment tax in whole through out the Goa State for a period of six months with effect from the date of release of the said film in the Goa State subject to the following conditions:—

- The rate of payment for admission shall be reduced to the extent of the entertainment tax payable on each admission tickets;
- The licensee of the auditorium where the said film is screened shall maintain separate account regarding the tickets for admission issued and submit them to the Commissioner of Entertainment Tax, Government of Goa, Panaji within one month from the date of the last screening of the film at each place;
- This order shall be exhibited in the prominent position at the time the public entrance to the place of entertainment at the time the public are admitted during the entertainment.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

K. M. Nambiar, Under Secretary (Finance Exp.).

Panaji, 21st April, 1988.

#### Law (Legal and Legislative Affairs) Department

##### Legislature Department

Order

No. LA/B/ESTT/1182/88

Read notice of retirement dated 20th January, 1988 of Smt. J. D. Deshpande Editor of Debates, Legislature Department.

Notice of voluntary retirement dated 20th January, 1988 under Rule 48 of Central Civil Service (Pension) Rules 1972 given by Smt. J. D. Deshpande Editor of Debates, Legislature Department is hereby accepted and Smt. J. D. Deshpande shall stand retired from the service w.e.f. 15th February, 1988 (A.N.).

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

A. B. Ulman, Under Secretary (Legislature).

Panaji, 15th April, 1988.

#### Law (Establishment) Department

Notification by the High Court of Judicature, Appellate Side, Bombay

No. A. 3902/G/86

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 11(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (No. 2 of 1974), the Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges are hereby pleased to confer the powers of a Judicial Magistrate of the First Class on the following Civil Judges, Junior Division:—

- 1) Shri R. R. Samant,  
Civil Judge, Junior Division, Margao.
- 2) Shri V. R. Dessai,  
Civil Judge, Junior Division, Panaji.
- 3) Shri U. V. Bakre,  
Civil Judge, Junior Division, Mapusa.  
(For newly created Court at Pernem).

High Court, Appellate Side,

Bombay, 28 March, 1988.

R. G. Sindhakar  
Registrar

Order

No. 4-9-84/LD(7)

In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (7) of section 2 of the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (Central Act 5 of 1908), read with order 27, rule 8B of the First Schedule to the said Code, the Government of Goa hereby appoints Shri Joaquim Dias, Advocate, Panaji as Government Pleader for the purpose of conducting and defending the appeals in acquisition proceedings initiated on behalf of the Economic Development Corporation of Goa before the High Court of Judicature at Bombay, Goa Bench, Panaji.

By order and in the name of the Governor of Goa.

Maria A. Rodrigues, Under Secretary (Law).

Panaji, 16th April, 1988.

Notification by the High Court of Judicature  
Appellate Side, Bombay

No. A. 3902/G/86

I

The Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges direct that the orders contained at Sr. Nos. 1 and 2 of the High Court Notification No. A. 3902/G/86, dated 24th March, 1988, in so far as they relate to the transfers and postings of S/Shri R. R. Samant and V. R. Dessai, be treated as cancelled.

II

The Honourable the Chief Justice and Judges make the following postings:—

Name and present posting	New posting
1. Shri R. R. Samant, Civil Judge, Junior Division, Margao.	Panaji
2. Shri V. R. Dessai, Civil Judge, Junior Division, Panaji.	Bicholim

High Court, Appellate Side,

Bombay, 6 April, 1988.

R. G. Sindhakar  
Registrar

## Department of Inland Water Transport

## Notification

No. 30/15/83-ILD

The below mentioned Notification bearing No. PT-18011-6/87-Pt(ii)(Pt.) dated 2nd March, 1988 received from the Government of India, Ministry Surface Transport (Ports Wing), New Delhi which is published in the Gazette of India Extraordinary, Part II Section 3(i) is hereby published as required under Sub-section (2) of the Section 132 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (Central Act 38 of 1963), for the general information of the public.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 4th April, 1988.

## GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(BHARAT SARKAR)

MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT/  
JAL BHUTAL PARIVAHAN MANTRALAYA

(Ports Wing - Pattan Paksh)

New Delhi, the 2nd March, 1988.

## Notification

G. S. R. ... In pursuance of the provisions of sub-clause (ii) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (38 of 1963) and in supersession of the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport, Department of Surface Transport (Ports Wing) No. G.S.R. 68(E) dated 27th January, 1986, the Central Government hereby specifies the number of persons mentioned in column 4 of the Table below to be elected by each of the bodies to represent each of the interests shown respectively in columns 2 and 3 of the said Table, on the Board of Trustees of the Port of Mormugao;

Provided that in the case of body mentioned against Serial Number 5 of the said Table being owned or controlled by the Government, the persons to be elected by such body shall be appointed by the Central Government.

TABLE

Sr. No.	Name of bodies		Number of persons to be appointed
1	2	3	4
1.	Goa Mineral Ore Exporters Association	Shippers	1
2.	Goa Chamber of Commerce and Industry	Shippers	1
3.	Indian National Shipowners Association	Shipowners	1
4.	Mormugao Ships 'Agents' Association	Other interests	1
5.	Mineral and Metal Trading Corporation	Exporters	1
6.	Goa Barge Owners Association	Other interest	1
Total			6

2. In pursuance of sub-section (4) of section 3 of the aforesaid Act, the Central Government hereby specifies the period ending with the 1st March, 1988 as the period within which the Election of Trustees shall be held.

3. This notification shall come into force on the 1st day of April, 1988.

(F. No. PT-18011-6/87-Pt(ii)(Pt.))

Sd/-

(YOGENDRA NARAIN)

Joint Secretary to the Government of India.

## Notification

No. 30/15/83-ILD

The below mentioned Notification bearing No. PT-18011/6/87-PT(i)(Pt.), dated 2-3-1988 received from the Government of India, Ministry of Surface Transport (Ports Wing), New Delhi which is published in the Gazette of India (Extraordinary) Part II Section 3(i) is hereby published as required under Sub-Section (2) of the Section 132 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (Central Act 38 of 1963), for general information of the public.

*Subhash V. Elekar*, Under Secretary (Industries and Labour).

Panaji, 4th April, 1988.

## GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

(BHARAT SARKAR)

MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT/  
JAL BHUTAL PARIVAHAN MANTRALAYA

(Ports Wing - Pattan Paksh)

New Delhi, the 2nd March, 1988.

## Notification

G. S. R. ... In pursuance of sub-clause (i) of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Major Port Trusts Act, 1963 (38 of 1963) and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Transport, Department of Surface Transport (Ports Wing) No. G.S.R. 67(E) dated 27-1-1986, the Central Government hereby specifies the number of persons mentioned in column (2) of the Table below to be appointed by that Government to represent the interests mentioned in column (1) of the said Table on the Board of Trustees of the Port of Mormugao.

TABLE

Interested to be represented	Number of persons to be appointed
1	2
Labour employed in the Port	2
Customs Department	1
Defence Services — Navy	1
Indian Railways	1
Government of Goa	1
Ministry of Surface Transport	1
Total	7

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st day of April, 1988.

(F. No. PT-18011/6/87-PT(i)(Pt.))

Sd/-

(YOGENDRA NARAIN)

Joint Secretary to the Government of India.

GOVT. PRINTING PRESS — GOA

(Imprensa Nacional — Goa)

PRICE — Rs. 1-05 Ps.